Gunnar Myrdal on Automation and the Negro, P. 3

Castro's Startling New Account in The New Republic of Why He Wanted Nuclear Missiles, See Page 2

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly

VOL. XI, NO. 25 DECEMBER 23, 1963 101 WASHINGTON, D. C. 20 CENTS

A Crisis and A Turning Point Approaches in Vietnam

The war in Vietnam is being lost. Only a few weeks ago, Secretary McNamara and General Taylor reported on their return from Saigon that "the major part" of our military role there could be "completed by the end of 1965." Now Hanson W. Baldwin, our most respected military expert, writes (*New York Times,* Dec. 7) that "unless public support in the U.S. and among its allies can be maintained *during years of frustration,* there is no possibility of victory." The italics are ours. President Johnson at his first meeting with the press that same day announced that Secretary McNamara is going back to Vietnam on another tour of inspection. It begins to look as if the Secretary of Defense has become a commuter between Washington and Saigon.

A Shift in U. S. Policy

It is clear that we are heading for a new crisis in South Vietnam; rebel attacks are mounting in size and frequency; the loss of arms to them is growing. At the same time Cambodia has formally asked Britain and the Soviet Union as co-chairmen of the 1954 Geneva Conference on Indochina to reconvene it. In August of last year, when Cambodia asked the Geneva conferees to reassemble and guarantee its neutrality, President Kennedy shied away from the idea. But this time the attitude of the American government seems to have changed. When the Foreign Minister of Cambodia was here to attend the President's funeral, he spoke with Under Secretary of State Harriman and was assured that we would not place obstacles in the way of reconvening the conference for this purpose. The first Geneva conference met, it will be recalled, to end the Korean war, and then went on to end the first Indochinese war as well. The new session could become a vehicle for the peaceful ending of the war in South Vietnam too. We are approaching a turning point, either to risk widening the conflict by intervening with our own combat troops, or settling the war at the conference table.

Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia indicated these wider possibilities when he called for an independent South Vietnam linked in a neutral confederation with Cambodia. "The reunification of Vietnam is the end to be attained but it is for the moment premature if not impossible, as responsible leaders of North Vietnam have admitted to me," said Prince Sihanouk (Agence France-Presse, *Le Monde,* Dec. 4), adding that he thought "the Communist camp would content itself with a South Vietnam completely neutral, as is Cambodia." An article in the *Peking Review* (Nov. 22) confirms this view. China would like new trade ties with the West to replace the broken trade ties with the Soviet Union. Peace in South Vietnam would remove a major obstacle to such relations. In South Vietnam itself the National Liberation Front has made clear in a clandestine interview (*Le Monde,* Aug. 24) that it did not wish to "exchange one dictatorship for another. A democratic South Vietnam, an honorable and face-saving peace are possible.

Unfortunately the U.S. public has been conditioned to such oversimplified and fallacious views on Asian foreign policy as to make negotiation difficult. The Cambodian Foreign Minister had a friendly talk with the new President, but if Mr. Johnson were a combination of Macchiavelli and King Solomon he would still have trouble with this one. Three ideas widely held in this country are obstacles to a sensible settlement. One is that problems arising in the areas bordering China can be settled without taking its views into account. We had to negotiate with China to end the Korean war and we will have to sit down at Geneva with China again to end the Vietnamese war. The second is that neutralism is a menace second only to Communism, though the only one of the three Indochinese states which is stable today, free from guerrilla war and any internal Communist threat is neutralist Cambodia.

The third obstacle to peace is public acceptance of the CIA as a proper agency of government. The first thing to be said of the CIA is that in Southeast Asia, at least, it has proven itself politically incompetent. Its favorite Indochinese protegés, Diem in South Vietnam and Phoumi Nosavan in Laos,

(Continued on Page Four)

How The CIA Makes Us Look Two-Faced

"Many are asking themselves whether America is the liberal "brain trust" which worked alongside President Kennedy or rather the services (still unpurged) of M. McCone, successor of M. Allen Dulles, the man of the Bay of Pigs of sinister memory. President Johnson would render his country an immense service if he ended this ambiguity, if he took steps to make America's government one in whose word foreigners could at last believe.

"Southeast Asia, in particular, is full of not very "quiet" Americans, sometimes camouflaged as diplomats, sometimes simple adventurers one can disavow, who vie with each other in stirring up trouble in countries of which they know little, mistaking for sincere friends mercenaries who make game of them, considering as enemies those who try to talk frankly with them —all persuaded that they are playing a great role and will make their personal idea of 'Americanism' triumph.

"The United States could do well without these imitation Macchiavellis who only exasperate Asian governments and peoples, perfectly aware of their intrigues big and little."

—From an editorial on the "two faces" of the American government in the Nov. 29 issue of Realités Cambodgiennes in Saigon, the first-rate weekly which is the unofficial organ of Cambodia's Prince Sihanouk.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The New Republic Publishes A "Blockbuster" of An Interview by Jean Daniel

Castro's Startling New Account of Why He Asked for Nuclear Missiles

There are three important points to be noted in the sensational "talks with Kennedy and Castro" by Jean Daniel in the Dec. 14 issue of *The New Republic*. The first, of course, is that it offers an entirely new version of the events which led up to last year's missile crisis over Cuba. According to Castro, six months before the missiles were emplaced Cuba was informed that a new invasion under CIA sponsorship was being planned. These reports were discussed with Khrushchev's son-in-law Adzhubei when he was in Havana on his way to Washington. Cuban alarm was increased when Adzhubei reported that President Kennedy informed him that the U.S. had decided it could no longer tolerate the existence of the Castro regime *and reminded the Russians that the U.S. had not intervened when they invaded Hungary*. The missiles, according to Castro, were emplaced to deter a new invasion.

Cuba's Demilitarization Offer

It is a pity the United Nations is not independent enough to investigate this thoroughly in Havana, Moscow and Washington. It throws new light on the formal Cuban offers to the UN in September, 1962, just before the crisis, to accept demilitarization if offered firm international guarantees against aggression. This fits Castro's account, for in effect it would have done peacefully what was soon done under threat of war—removal of the missiles in exchange for a qualified U.S. agreement not to invade.

The second point to be noted is Castro's remark, "for us Cubans it didn't really make so much difference whether we died by conventional bombing or a hydrogen bomb." Here is the key to that proliferation which will soon make this a most dangerous planet unless a new world order can be brought into being. Each country, however tiny, will be ready to risk the future of the planet if its own existence is at stake. Moscow felt that only nuclear arms could deter an American attack. Curiously this is what John Foster Dulles advocated in a *Foreign Affairs* article (Autumn. 1957) when he proposed to abandon massive retaliation for the distribution of nuclear weapons to all our allies on the Sino-Soviet periphery so "as to make military invasion with conventional weapons a hazardous attempt." This was Khrushchev's strategy.

The third point could be a key to peace with Cuba. M. Daniel asked Kennedy if we could tolerate "economic collectivism." The President replied by citing our good relations with Tito and Sekou Touré. When M. Daniel reported this to Castro the latter replied, "Why am I not Tito or Sekou Touré? Because the Russians have never done us any injury such as the Yugoslavians and the Guineans have complained of in the past, and the Americans have never given us any of the benefits for which these two nations congratulate themselves today."

M. Daniel was invited by Kennedy to come back and talk with him after seeing Castro. The distinguished French journalist, an editor of *L'Express*, felt that he could thus play the role of an unofficial emissary. Castro's answer was not that of a puppet but of a man with no alternatives. It is a tragedy that the President's death cut short what might have been a fruitful dialogue. The fact is that Cuba is in the Soviet camp because it has no alternative. It is the only country to emerge from the anti-colonial struggle which has joined the Soviet camp; all the others have been left free by U.S. policy to deal with both East and West. Adhzubei himself in talking informally with reporters at the Soviet Embassy during that visit asked, "You get along with Guinea, why not Cuba?" From all indications the Russians would be relieved if a wiser U.S. policy enabled Cuba to move into a neutralist position. Until then there will always be the danger of a new world crisis over Cuba.

The Right to Travel

The Internal Security Act of 1950 was the first law in U.S. history to make a man's politics the test of his right to travel. It is good news that the Supreme Court has agreed to hear a clear test of these provisions in appeals brought by Elizabeth Gurley Flynn and Dr. Herbert Aptheker, leading functionaries of the Communist Party. This will probably also decide a related test, that of Milton S. Mayer, who was refused a passport because he declined on principal to state whether or not he was a Communist.

Another type of the new travel restrictions which have grown up since the second World War must wait on disposal of six pending Cuban travel cases. They will test the State Department's right to put little Iron Curtains around countries of which it does not approve, like China and Cuba. The latest of these cases arise from indictment of four of the 59 students who went to Cuba last summer. It is a pleasure to record one minor victory. A Federal judge in New York has rejected an attempt by the U.S. Attorney's office to restrict the four to New York City and its environs so they could not accept invitations from colleges around the country to speak about their trip and their prosecution!

Smathers Who Hates Castro Also Hates Decent Wages for Florida Farm Workers

Senator Smathers of Florida, a leading advocate of action to "liberate" China, is also carrying on a crusade to liberate Florida fruit growers from the need to pay halfway decent wages to the migrants and the miserable foreign workers who pick their crops. In both campaigns he seems to have had too much White House influence.

Just three days before President Kennedy's assassination, a Catholic priest who heads the National Catholic Rural Life Conference protested this influence. Last July the Labor Department set a minimum wage for these workers in Florida of 95 cents an hour. Though this was 20 cents less than the Department of Agriculture (notably sympathetic to growers) had set for unskilled labor in the Florida sugar cane harvest, the growers protested to Senator Smathers. According to this priest, Father James Vizzard, Smathers was turned down by Labor Secretary Wirtz and by Attorney General Kennedy, but persuaded President Kennedy to suspend the rate and order rehearings.

"I am not so unsophisticated as to be shocked when political deals do occur," Father Vizzard testified at the rehearing in Washington. "But I hope I never become so cynical as not to be outraged by a deal like this which sells down the river the poorest of America's poor. It is, to say the very least, demeaning to the office of the President that he should pay a political debt or buy a vote or do a favor with pennies snatched from the hands of the poor."

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

From Dr. Gunnar Myrdal's Testimony Dec. 3 Before the Clark Subcommittee on Manpower

Famous Swedish Expert Sees Automation As Blessing If Economy Is Planned

Since May 20 a Senate subcommittee under Senator Clark (D. Pa.) has been holding hearings which may have historic impact. They deal with the problem of retraining and fully utilizing the nation's manpower in the light of the twin crises created by automation and the Negro uprising. Here we give some excerpts from the plea made before the committee Dec. 3 by the famous Swedish economist Dr. Gunnar Myrdal for more economic planning by government to end America's "relative stagnation."

Dr. MYRDAL: I am not using this word "automation" so much, because after all, it is a very old story. It is technological progress. We have just as much automation going on in Sweden. Our agricultural population is shrinking just as rapidly. Our trade unions, differently from yours, are all for automation. But the explanation is very simple, and that is full employment. If demand is kept up, if the economy is expanding, then automation is good for everybody. It is the basis of higher wages for workers, and it is the basis for more production.

Expansion of Demand Needed

The basic problem, more basic than automation, is the fact that there is not enough expansion of demand in this country. There are many people who are not living an affluent life in America, and you have the export markets and everything which is needed in underdeveloped countries. And in addition we in the rich countries should gradually see a change where more and more of the labor force is utilized for services, teaching, nursing, caring for old people, caring for culture, scholarship.

But that is a process which does not go automatically, and particularly if you start out, in America, with a rather high unemployment, I think there is a transitional problem. With this great tremendous stream of young people which you are getting into the labor market now, you must be very careful to give more education, and more vocational education also, to these youngsters so they may fit into the greater America of the future.

You have a very excellent educational system for the great majority of Americans who live in an affluent society, but a rather bad situation for those who live in the slums, the rural slums and the city slums. And in addition to that, since you cannot very rapidly make a nurse out of a half-illiterate Negro, you have transitional employment, i.e. to employ them in reconstruction, where there is a rather simple problem of re-education. And it is almost a (good) fortune that you have such tremendous amounts to be done in reconstructing your cities and modernizing your transport system.

I am very much against all those radicals who say that you can solve the problem just by giving the unemployed full wages, or nearly full wages, because there is nothing which can cure unemployment except employment.

I am an old Puritan in many ways and I believe that I am speaking for ordinary Americans. It is the dignity of life to be employed somewhere, and to do something for society. Well, what you have to do is of course to have very much greater expenditures for real city renewal, not the city renewal you have had up to now, which has been building houses not for poor people, but rather middle class people, and driving the poor into new slums.

There is a lot of construction work which needs to be done, and the speeding up of educating what I call the under class, where they are dropping out of school. I realize that this is a tremendous thing, because it will cost very much more money of the budget. I believe that this is bound to make the country richer, because here you have a vast amount of unutilized resources in your unemployed and your underemployed. It would make the country richer, and of course also prepare it to carry a very much bigger burden for the public expenditures. Here you cannot rely upon industry, private industry.—*Before the Clark committee, Dec. 3.*

Q.E.D.

"I am sometimes very surprised when I meet industrialists in this country. I find them tremendously knowledgeable in their particular field, and I find them full of superstitions and idiotic ideas as soon as they start to talk about the country."

—From Dr. Myrdal's plea for more government planning before the Clark subcommittee, Dec. 3.

"Mr. Rubel [head of the Union Oil Company] said profits 'should rank right alongside such hallowed concepts as home and mother and the American flag'."

—From the New York Times account Dec. 5 of the Nat'l Assn of Manufacturers annual meeting.

Dr. Gunnar Myrdal Opposes Priority Treatment or Job Quotas for Negroes

"I believe that everything should be done to put the Negroes on the basis of equality, so far as the law is concerned. And I am optimistic enough to believe that (all this can be done) within a period of ten years. However, you will still have many of the problems left. There will continue to be discrimination against Negroes in a society where you do not have full employment, a very important pre-condition for giving reality to legal equality.

"In addition to that, sir, there is also the fact that because of the history of the Negro, he is less efficient in many ways. Perhaps half of the grown-up Negroes are for all practical purposes illiterate.

"I am, however, not for preferential treatment of Negroes, and I will try to explain why. First, because I do not think it is politically wise. Nobody sitting in this room feels responsible for having brought Negroes as slaves to America. That argument that we have a guilt does not work politically. I mean we are responsible for the society as it is now, and not for the whole history.

"But quite aside from that, I think it is wrong, because Negroes are, it is true, perhaps the largest portion of what I would call the under-class in America, but they are by far not alone. You have poor whites all over the place. You have the Puerto Ricans, you have the Mexicans, you have the workers in agriculture in many places. It will be absolutely wrong to give priority to one group, even if it is the biggest group. What you have to do is to make life decent and productive for all these poor people in the underclass. I think it is very unfair and against American principles to discriminate in favor of any group because of color. It is almost as bad as doing the opposite."

—Dr. Myrdal before the Clark committee, Dec. 3.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

How Long Are We Going to Support An Assassination Agency?

(Continued from Page One)

have been utterly discredited; the latter only opened the door to Communism, the former had to be "removed" when his failure and instability became too notorious. The one Indochinese ruler the CIA has always regarded with disfavor is the only one who has succeeded. Cambodia under Sihanouk's leadership, Majority Leader Mansfield told the Senate the other day (Nov. 20), "has developed within its borders a remarkable degree of progress and political cohesion and stability and a level of human freedom and political participation in the life of the nation which exceeds most if not all of the other nations of southeast Asia." Yet as the *Washington Post* said in a recent editorial (Nov. 14), the CIA "has for a long time tended to consider the non-aligned Sihanouk as a pernicious fellow."

Does The Right Hand Know?

The second thing to be said of the CIA is that the very existence of a secret agency which boasts of "cloak and dagger" activities in countries with which we are at peace creates suspicions which poison our foreign relations. Both President Johnson and Secretary Harriman denied to the Cambodian Foreign Minister that the CIA had been engaged in plots against its government. But no one can be sure that the right hand of our government really knows what this left hand is doing.

Cambodia's first charges of a CIA plot were made in 1959 when it expelled Victor Matsui, an official of the U.S. Embassy for activities incompatible with diplomacy; Cambodia claimed that rebel groups had been given radio transmitters with which they kept in touch with the U.S. Embassy. The next incident was the capture of an anti-Sihanouk emissary with 270 kilograms of pure gold for the rebels; he confessed that he had been in contact with CIA agents not only in Cambodia but in Washington. Later an elaborate "gift" was presented at the Royal Palace and turned out to be an ingenious bomb intended to kill the King and Queen; three members of the Court lost their lives when it exploded. It had come by ship from Vietnam and its intricacy led the Cambodians to suspect skilled CIA hands at work. Then they learned that the secret rebel radio was operating from a house in Saigon under the very nose of U.S. and Vietnamese authorities, and felt this could not happen without their connivance. Another assassination attempt came last spring, when the President of Communist China visited Cambodia. Conspirators were caught in an attempt to mine the road over which he would pass with Prince Sihanouk on his way from the airport. The latest incident was the confession of a rebel infiltrator from South Vietnam that anti-Sihanouk forces worked out of strategic hamlets near the Cambodian border in close liaison with both Vietnamese and U.S. military authorities. These are the incidents which led Prince Sihanouk to break off American aid, fearing that aid agencies were a means by which hostile American agents penetrated his country.

Again I ask—in the wake of our own President's assassination—how long are we going to maintain what other nation's consider an assassination agency of our own?

Slowly Catching Up

"Under Ngo Din Diem, the hamlet program aroused deep popular resentment . . . tens of thousands of peasants were forced to leave their homes and build new surrounded by barbed-wire barricades. Communist propaganda focussed effectively on the most objectionable aspects of the program calling the hamlets concentration camps.' . . . This charge, according to U.S. officials, was all too accurate in many instances."

—New York Times from Saigon Dec. 3.

As long ago as *The Weekly* of April 17, 1961, in calling attention to some dangerously rose-colored views of Diem's regime, we compared the picture drawn of these hamlets by Leo Cherne in the *New York Times* Sunday Magazine, April 9, 1961, with that drawn by Robert Guillian, the Far Eastern expert of *Le Monde* (Paris) three days earlier. Cherne called them Diem's "most imaginative project . . . the most dramatic and fruitful pioneering rural ventures since the Israeli cooperative farm, the kibbutz." M. Guillian said this rural experiment "conducted in haste and in often brutal fashion, has been almost everywhere a political and economic failure." We're glad to see the *Times* catch up.

Warmest Best Wishes for the Holidays and the New Year

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

12/23/63

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I.F. Stone's Bi-Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.

Second class postage paid at Washington, D. C.

I. F. Stone's Bi-Weekly. Second Class Postage Paid at Washington, D. C. Published every other Monday except in August at 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W., Washington, D. C. An independent bi-weekly published and edited by I. F. Stone; Circulation Manager, Esther M. Stone. Subscription: $5 in the U.S.; $6 in Canada; $10 elsewhere. Air Mail rates: $15 to Europe; $20 to Israel, Asia and Africa.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED